IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA MACON DIVISION

ORASAMA ANDREWS, :

:

Petitioner,

Case No. 5:01-CR-56 (CAR)

:

vs. : Proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1651

:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

:

Respondent. :

ORDER ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before the Court is United States Magistrate Judge Charles H. Weigle's
Recommendation [Doc. 202] to deny Petitioner-s Motion for Writ of Error Coram
Nobis [Doc. 167] and dismiss as moot the remaining pending motions in this case
[Docs. 171, 172, 173, & 174]. Plaintiff has filed an Objection to the
Recommendation [Doc. 203]. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. '636(b)(1), the Court has
thoroughly considered Petitioner's Objection, has made a de novo determination of
the portions of the Recommendation to which Petitioner objects, and finds the
Objection to be without merit. Having considered the Recommendation, this
Court agrees with the findings and conclusions of the United States Magistrate

Judge. As thoroughly explained in the Recommendation and despite Petitioner's arguments otherwise, none of his four alleged errors in this case fall within the exceedingly narrow range of fundamental factual errors recognized by the Eleventh Circuit and the Supreme Court for the "extraordinary remedy of last resort"—the writ of error coram nobis.¹

The Recommendation [Doc. 202] is therefore **ADOPTED** and **MADE THE ORDER OF THE COURT**, and Petitioner's Motion for Writ of Error Coram Nobis

[Doc. 167] is hereby **DENIED**. All other pending Motions in this case – Petitioner's

Motion to Amend Writ of Error Coram Nobis [Doc. 171]; Petitioner's Second

Motion to Supplement Writ of Error Coram Nobis [Doc. 172]; Petitioner's Third

Motion to Supplement Writ of Error Coram Nobis [Doc. 173]; and the

Government's Motion to Dismiss Writ of Error Coram Nobis [Doc. 174] are hereby **DISMISSED as moot**.

SO ORDERED, this 17th day of May, 2013.

S/ C. Ashley RoyalC. ASHLEY ROYALUNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SSH

¹ *United States v. Mills*, 221 F.3d 1201, 1203 (11th Cir. 2000).